DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 441 SO 012 105

AUTHOR Sanders, Nicholas M.; Wallace, Joan D.
TITLE Teacher and Parent Opinion Concerning Moral/Ethical Education in the Public Schools: A Report of an Institute for Survey Research Study. Technical Report No. 2.
INSTITUTION Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 28p.
AVAILABLE FROM Research for Better Schools, Inc., 444 North Third Street, Philadelphia, PA 19123 ($1.75)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Planning; Educational Objectives; *Ethical Instruction; Humanistic Education; Junior High Schools; *Moral Values; *Parent Attitudes; Relevance (Education); *School Role; Secondary Education; Self Actualization; Socialization; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

The report summarizes a study to determine societal perceptions of the role of the public schools in providing moral/ethical education (M/E). Group discussions were tape recorded of both junior high school teachers and parents of junior high school students in Philadelphia, Memphis, Minneapolis, and Los Angeles. Results indicated that both groups believe that the public schools unavoidably play a role in M/E instruction since teachers (whether or not they seek it) are seen by students as role models. Emphasis was placed on specialized training for M/E teachers and a general familiarity with M/E programs for all teachers. Most agreed that present efforts in M/E instruction are inadequate. Concerning the content of M/E programs, participants generally believed that consideration for others should be taught and that socialization for participation in society should be a major objective. There was general agreement that self-actualization should be an outcome of moral/ethical programs and that the content should be relevant to student concerns. The most significant conclusion is that consensus was found on a wide number of M/E issues among the groups. The group moderator's guide and a summary of teacher and parent opinions on individual questions are provided. (Author/KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

- ED178441

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ulik Rouk

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TEACHER AND PARENT OPINION CONCERNING MORAL/ETHICAL EDUCATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: A REPORT OF AN INSTITUTE FOR SURVEY RESEARCH STUDY

by
Nicholas M. Sanders
and
Joan D. Wallace

Publication No. BJ-4

Winter, 1975

SP 012 105

RESEARCH FOR BETTER SCHOOLS, Inc.
1700 MARKET STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

The **Humanizing Learning Program** is one of six programs of **Research for Better Schools, Inc. (RBS)**, a private nonprofit corporation founded in 1965 and currently funded by the National Institute of Education. The aim of RBS is to restructure education, with emphasis on individualizng and humanizing the learning process.

The task of the **Humanizing Learning Program (HLP)** is to close the gap between the skills presently taught by our schools and the skills that children need for social, intellectual, and emotional growth. We teach children to read words, but not how to apply content; we teach them arithmetic, but not how to solve problems; we teach them to recite, but not how to communicate; we teach them to behave themselves, but not how to *be* themselves. In an effort to redress this neglect, **HLP** designs, builds, and disseminates skill-oriented curriculum materials teaching effective action in the interpersonal, cognitive, and affective domains. The materials actively engage both student and teacher in the learning process. To date, efforts have focused on three types of activities: the development of a knowledge base, the development of curriculum content, and the design and production of instructional materials that can be used by teachers to achieve classroom effects in the three domains (see back cover for representative products.)

TEACHER AND PARENT OPINION CONCERNING MORAL/ETHICAL EDUCATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: A REPORT OF AN INSTITUTE FOR SURVEY RESEARCH STUDY

Technical Report No. 2

Nicholas M. Sanders and Joan D. Wallace

with preface by Richard B. Vanderveer

Institute for Survey Research
Temple University
Philadelphia, PA 19122

HUMANIZING LEARNING PROGRAM
a division of RESEARCH FOR BETTER SCHOOLS, INC.
Robert G. Scanlon, Executive Director

1700 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215 561-4100

Winter 1975

Preface

As a part of the Institute for Survery Research's (ISR) ongoing research on a wide variety of social issues, we were pleased to conduct for Research for Better Schools, Inc. (RBS), a group-interview study of attitudes toward moral/ethical training programs in the public schools. We believe the findings of the study provide unbiased indications of themes, affect, terminology, and other aspects of the ways in which some parents and teachers of junior high school students view moral education.

The present RBS summary is both accurate and clear, reflecting the salient points succinctly but without distortion.

Richard B. Vanderveer
Institute for Survey Research
Temple University
Philadelphia, PA 19122

TEACHER AND PARENT OPINION CONCERNING MORAL/ETHICAL EDUCATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: A REPORT OF AN INSTITUTE FOR SURVEY RESEARCH STUDY[1]

Nicholas M. Sanders and Joan D. Wallace

Humanizing Learning Program
Research for Better Schools, Inc.
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

This report summarizes one of two studies conducted to determine societal perceptions of the role of the public schools in providing moral/ethical education (M/E).[2] Both studies were initiated in concert with the early stage of development of instructional materials designed to provide M/E for junior high school students. Though the materials developers had been encouraged to begin their work on the basis of many need indications in the press and by sociological and psychoiogical commentators, no strong mandate for public school M/E from those most directly involved in educating the young had been documented.

The present study and the previous one represent two different approaches to determining attitudes concerning the public school's role in providing M/E. In the previous study, public school goal statements adopted by various State Departments of Education and by national teacher, school-administrator, school-parent, religious, and legal organizations were systematically analyzed for their moral/ethical content. The content analysis of publicly available documents allows for an unobtrusive study of the issue of the public schools' role in providing M/E, as perceived by representative organizations most directly concerned with educating the young.

[1] The present study was conducted in conjunction with the design of an instructional course in the moral/ethical domain. The course, *Skills for Ethical Action,* is being developed for junior high school students by the Humanizing Learning Program of Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa., with financial support from the National Institute of Education. The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not represent official positions of either Research for Better Schools or the National Institute of Education.

[2] The other study has been reported in *The Importance and Desired Characteristics of Moral/Ethical Education in the Public Schools of the U.S.A.: A Systematic Analysis of Recent Documents*, by Nicholas M. Sanders and Marcia B. Klafter. Available from Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.

However, such an indirect approach has two limitations: (a) it does not allow for in-depth exploration of the issues; and (b) it may represent only official views, not necessarily the "firing-line" views of those in direct educational contact with the young. Thus, the study reported here was conducted to add new dimensions to and supplement the previous study findings.

The present study used an open-ended interview procedure with two types of groups, junior high school teachers and parents of junior high school students. To eliminate the biases of the M/E materials-development staff from the usually bias-sensitive interview procedure, the study was contracted to an independent agency experienced in survey procedures, the Institute for Survey Research (ISR) of Temple University in Philadelphia. This paper summarizes the ISR report.[3]

Methods

The choice of method was intended to allow for in-depth, open-ended exploration of the issues related to M/E in the public schools. Two potentially suitable techniques, individual interview and group discussion, were considered. The distinctive strength of the individual-interview procedure is the respondent's independence from social influence. However, in dealing with questions that may in the real world require an exploration of issues with others and development of some consensus (such as the determination of the public school's role in M/E), this independent view is less relevant (and less realistic) than the interchange among persons with possibly differing views. Therefore, the group-discussion format was chosen as being a more appropriate methodology.

Sample

The populations of interest were defined as: (a) opinion-leader parents of junior high school students, and (b) opinion-leader junior high school teachers of social studies and English. For overwhelming practical reasons, no attempt was made to obtain random samples of these populations. Instead, the following procedures were used:

1. In each of four U.S. Census regions of the U.S.A., a city was identified as having at least 10 junior high schools. The cities chosen on this basis were Los Angeles, Memphis, Minneapolis, and Philadelphia.

[3] Vanderveer, R.B. *A Study of Teacher and Parent Attitudes Toward Moral/Ethical Training Programs in the Public Schools.* Temple University, Institute for Survey Research, Spring 1975.

2. Junior high schools within each city were dichotomized by income level of the school neighborhood in order to insure participation of respondents associated with schools from varied economic-level surroundings. Ranges of neighborhood average incomes for the schools are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Range of Average Income in School Neighborhoods Represented in the Present Study

City	Income	
	Low	High
Philadelphia	$3,549 to $6,514	$7,227 to $13,929
Memphis	$2,049 to $5,451	$8,158 to $13,150
Minneapolis	$2,631 to $7,045	$9,196 to $14,115
Los Angeles	$3,626 to $5,235	$6,918 to $14,318

3. The principals of schools in each income-neighborhood grouping furnished the names of potential teacher and parent opinion leaders.

4. The potential participants were then contacted by an ISR staff member, who briefly described the nature of the study and offered a $20 incentive for participation. A minimum of 8 and a maximum of 12 participants were sought for each group session (one for teachers and one for parents, in each city). In order to minimize chances of an established influence relationship among group-session members, only one participant for a given session was sought from a school. Also, for each session an attempt was made to balance the number of males and females and the number from high- and low-income schools; in the teacher sessions a balance was sought in the number of social studies and English teacher participants. Table 2 summarizes the resulting composition of the groups.

Procedures

The first two group sessions were held in Philadelphia in ISR's offices. Each discussion was tape-recorded, and the tapes were reviewed by appropriate RBS staff members before further groups were convened.

All other group sessions were conducted in the conference rooms of centrally located hotels in the selected cities. In each city, parent and teacher groups were conducted on consecutive evenings, with each group session lasting approximately 2 hours.

Table 2

Composition of Discussant Groups

City	Characteristics						
		Sex		Income level		Subject taught	
	n	M	F	High	Low	English	Social studies
Teachers							
Philadelphia	9	7	2	4	5	5	4
Memphis	10	4	6	4	6	5	5
Minneapolis	7	5	2	3	4	5[a]	6[a]
Los Angeles	13	7	6	7	6	7	6
Parents							
Philadelphia	9	0	9	6	3	–	–
Memphis	9	5	4	5	4	–	–
Minneapolis	12	6	6	5	7	–	–
Los Angeles	8	4	4	4	4	–	–

[a]3 teachers taught both English and social studies and are included in both totals.

A *Group Moderator's Guide* (see Appendix 1) was used by Dr. R.B. Vanderveer and Mr. A. Hontz, each of whom conducted four groups.

Individual Group Analyses

In order to reduce the discussions to a useable format, the tape recording of each group session was submitted to a multistep analysis procedure. First, each tape was reviewed independently by at least two ISR Study Direction Department staff members, with a total of five staff members participating in this process. Information gathered from the tapes was organized under the topical headings of the *Group Moderator's Guide* in order to present findings in a consistent order and format. The reviewers then combined their separate reviews into a description of each tape. If discrepancies in substance or interpretation of the tape recordings occurred, the portions of the tapes in question were again reviewed.

Several aspects of this process should be noted. First, although sampling was carried out so as to maximize demographic variability, limited sample size, as well as the use of audio (rather than video) taping, precluded analysis by demographic status.

Second, the study results are necessarily more qualitative than quantitative in nature. Every effort was made to incorporate in the report such subjective criteria as spontaneity and length of discussion, number of persons addressing a point, activity level of the discussion, etc. When consensus on an issue was not obtained, the report presents both the majority opinion and specific comments of dissenters.

Summaries

Following the above procedures, separate overall analyses were prepared for the teachers' and parents' groups. This step was carried out in a series of meetings involving all staff members who had reviewed the individual tapes. In preparing these summaries, emphasis was placed on those points which were agreed upon by the majority of the respondents in each group. Significant dissenting viewpoints, which were expressed across several groups, were also included.

Findings

This section summarizes the results presented in the report by Richard Vanderveer for ISR. The present authors have endeavored to abstract the ISR study results and reorganize their presentation so as to make them more immediately useful, while retaining the substance of the ISR report. Study findings are summarized for the teacher and parent groups according to a topic organization derived from the *Group Moderator's Guide* (see Appendix 1). More detailed breakdowns of responses by city are presented in table form in Appendices 2 and 3, for teachers and parents, respectively.

Definition of "Moral" and "Ethical"

Teachers. Regardless of geographic area, most teachers agreed that: (a) these terms primarily connote the ways in which a person relates to himself and to mankind; (b) concepts of "right" and "wrong" are brought to mind by these terms; (c) judgment is a basic component of moral and ethical behavior; (d) morals are more related to one's culture and immediate environment, while ethics are more universal; and (e) the distinctions between these terms are of relatively low salience in considering M/E.

Parents. In general, "right" vs. "wrong" was the most frequently mentioned concept in discussing these terms. Most parents indicated that "moral" and "ethical" relate to the ways

people behave toward one another. Several parents felt that "moral" indicates behavior appropriate to the immediate environment, while "ethical" connotes more universal standards of "right" and "wrong." Others felt that the two terms are interchangeable.

Role of Schools in M/E

Teachers. There was almost unanimous agreement that teachers serve, either directly or indirectly, as role models of moral behavior, with divided and, in one case, shifting opinion as to whether M/E is a proper school responsibility.

Parents. A large majority in each group supported the public schools playing a role in M/E. Most agreed that teachers serve as role models of moral behavior, and that their classroom "vibrations" are currently the major (informal) component of moral training. The small minority (3 of 38) who opposed schools providing M/E felt that the home and religious organizations should assume the major responsibility and that schools should be limited to teaching basic academic skills.

Role of Junior High Schools in M/E

Teachers. All of the groups, in general, expressed the opinion that junior high schools should play some role in the M/E process and that junior high school curricula should prepare students for adult life. Opinion was divided concerning the optimal time to introduce M/E, with almost an equal split between those favoring junior high age and those considering it too late or too circumscribed as to time.

Parents. Two main points of view were expressed. First, slightly more than half the parents indicated that junior high school is too late to initiate M/E and favored its introduction in elementary school (though several felt "better late than never"). Others felt that junior high school is the ideal time for M/E, since students are changing psychologically and physically and thus are open to new ideas and need moral guidance.

Role of Interaction of Junior High School with Home and Social Institutions

Teachers. There was heavy agreement across the board that there is little or no interaction between a junior high school and students' homes or social organizations (with some suggesting that "the street" is a more relevant interaction factor). It was almost unanimously felt that the home and social institutions have defaulted in their M/E responsibilities, creating a vacuum which schools and teachers perforce must fill.

Parents. While most agreed that, ideally, there should be interaction between the home and the school, a large majority felt that such interaction does not exist and that the school must assume the major burden of M/E. Respondents in all four cities advocated increased interaction between home and school, maintaining that this would strengthen M/E in the schools.

M/E in General or Special Curriculum?

Teachers. Responses to this issue were conflicting. Respondents in Philadelphia and Los Angeles indicated that M/E should be taught as a component of existing courses, whereas teachers in Memphis and Minneapolis favored specific M/E classes. Overall, however, this distinction was of relatively low importance.

Parents. Most parents concurred that M/E should be taught in both general curricula and specific courses. The points were made that the entire school staff should be aware of, and participate to some degree in, an M/E program and that M/E teachers should receive special training. Those Philadelphia and Los Angeles parents who favored a special time allotment for M/E emphasized the desirability of conducting the program on a regular, ongoing basis.

Awareness of and Attitude Toward Existing M/E Curricula

Teachers. In general, teachers indicated that a minimal amount of M/E training is currently conducted in their schools. They evaluated the materials as insufficient, chiefly because of their limited scope.

Parents. Most parents indicated that some M/E is currently included in health, hygiene, or family-living courses. All parents favoring M/E in the schools felt that present M/E efforts are inadequate.

What Values (if any) Should be Learned

Teachers. Overall, the groups felt that exploration of self and consideration for others are the two major values that should be learned.

Parents. Self-respect and consideration for others (including racial tolerance and respect for others' property) were most often mentioned as being of primary importance. Honesty was also suggested by two separate groups.

Appropriate Source of the Values Involved in School Instruction

Teachers. Most of the teachers agreed that students should be a source of values in any public school program and that teachers should help students to learn about values. A number of respondents across the country (although chiefly in Philadelphia) agreed that teachers (like it or not) would always serve as role models through their behavior in the classroom. The use of ancillary materials to accompany this modeling role was generally perceived as legitimate.

Parents. A majority indicated that both exogenous and endogenous sources of values are appropriate: teachers, materials, peers, and the students themselves.

Self-Actualization vs. Socialization As Primary Goal of M/E

Teachers. The opinions were mixed. Most teachers felt that these two goals, for all practical purposes, are bound together and cannot be viewed as discrete objectives. Memphis and Minneapolis respondents emphasized a balance of self-actualization and socialization, with younger and female respondents maintaining that self-actualization should be a primary goal, while older and male respondents maintained that socialization is more imporant. Some of the Philadelphia group favored self-actualization as the primary goal, although the emphasis was on a crisis, problem-solving orientation. Los Angeles respondents favored socialization, though agreeing that a combination would be desirable.

Parents. In general, the respondents considered both self-actualization and socialization as desirable M/E goals. The Memphis and Philadelphia groups named socialization as the priority goal, while the Los Angeles and Minneapolis groups felt that the goal of self-actualization should take chronological precedence over socialization.

Evaluation Criteria

Teachers. The teachers were approximately evenly divided on this issue. Some said they would be satisfied with M/E if it improved student understanding of moral behavior, while others felt that measurable changes in student behavior should be the major criterion of M/E effectiveness.

Parents. Overall, both increased understanding and behavioral change were viewed as concerns, with the respondents approximately equally divided as to which goal should take precedence.

Relatedness of Content to Age-Group Taught

Teachers. The respondents agreed unanimously that student-relevance should be a primary M/E characteristic.

Parents. There was unanimity that all materials and concepts should be student-relevant.

Self-Revealing Nature of Some M/E-Related Methodologies

Teachers. Most respondents felt that students should not be forced to reveal their feelings or values. Voluntary self-revelation was considered desirable.

Parents. Although most parents felt that students would not object to revealing their feelings, the Minneapolis group opposed even optional self-revelation.

What To Avoid in M/E

Teachers. Most of the respondents indicated that students should not be forced to reveal their feelings. A majority also commented that M/E should be flexible, avoid "hard and fast" rules, and teach students to analyze situations and use reasoning to determine appropriate behavior. Regional differences and shifting standards were cited as problems. Several respondents believed that the junior high age group might lack the reading and cognitive abilities to benefit from highly complex materials.

Parents. Some respondents maintained that students should not be forced to reveal their values or their feelings. Others recommended excluding religion.

Summary Overview

In the present study the opinions of teachers and parents of junior high school students were sought in order to analyze and classify their perceptions regarding the appropriate role of the junior high school in M/E. Though opinions expressed in the eight discussion sessions differed at times, strong agreement among session participants – both parents and teachers – occurred in most substantive areas.

Each session began with a discussion of the meaning of, or distinction between, the terms *moral* and *ethical* (see *Group Moderator's Guide*, Appendix 1). All agreed that these terms generally referred to "right" and "wrong" behavior in relationship to others. The distinction between the terms was not seen as a salient issue.

It was universally conceded that the public school unavoidably plays a role in M/E, since teachers (whether or not they seek it) are seen by students as role models. In addition, there was consensus that the home and religious groups have, in effect, defaulted on their responsibility to provide M/E. All parent groups advocated some type of partnership between home and school to strengthen school M/E programs; however, both parents and teachers were pessimistic that such interaction could be achieved. Emphasis was placed on specialized training for M/E teachers and a general familiarity of M/E programs for all teachers in a school providing M/E. It was further felt that M/E content should be taught as either a special curriculum or as a clearly designated part of traditional subjects in order to insure its inclusion in the school program. Finally, though all participants were aware of school courses that touch on M/E to varying extents, it was generally agreed that these efforts are inadequate.

With regard to the content of M/E programs, it was generally felt that M/E should focus on prosocial themes: (a) the value of consideration for others should be taught, and (b) socialization for participation in society should be a major objective.

Other issues, not seen as contradictory to the above themes, concerned the involvement of the students. There was general agreement that increased self-actualization and self-respect should be outcomes of M/E; there was unanimous consensus that the content of M/E should be made relevant to student concerns; and last, there was strong emphasis on *encouraging* students to express their values, although *forced* student self-revelation was generally opposed.

There was strong opposition to M/E stipulating generalized, inflexible rules for moral/ethical behavior for all persons under all circumstances. Nonetheless, most participants were hopeful that M/E in the schools would lead to increased moral behavior, though some felt that changes in thinking and attitudes (as opposed to behavioral change) were all that could be expected.

The implications of the findings for developers of M/E programs and materials are several. At the least, their efforts will be seen as possibly filling a gap in the public school program. Programs and materials that allow for considerable student involvement and avoid rigid prescriptions promise to be more popular. Perhaps the most significant conclusion is that marked consensus was found on a wide number of M/E issues among groups which were diverse in both their relationship to students and their geographical setting.

Appendix 1

Group Moderator's Guide

I. Introduction (5 minutes)
   - A. Identify ISR and RBS
   - B. Purpose of this study
     1. across the country – in 4 cities
     2. interviewing parents and teachers of junior high school students
   - C. Anonymity and importance of each person's comments

II. Definition of important terms by group (5 minutes)
   - A. Moral
   - B. Ethical

III. Participants' perceptions of roles in moral and ethical education (15 minutes)
   - A. Role of schools in general
   - B. Role of junior high schools in particular
   - C. Interaction of junior high with:
     1. home
     2. religious organizations
     3. other institutions (specify_____)
   - D. Tap dyanamics of the above points (the does vs. should)
   - E. Moral education role of junior high school through general educational program, etc., vs. special curriculum
   - F. Aware of any present moral education curricula? If so:
     1. what type?
     2. how adequate?

IV. Primary values in and purposes of moral education (15 minutes)
   - A. What values (if any) should be learned?
     1. value life and well-being of others?
     2. justice?
     3. helpfulness, courage, generosity?
     4. self-respect?
     5. openness?

B. Which are seen as appropriate sources of values?
   1. students?
   2. teachers/materials?

C. Primary rationale for moral education in the schools: self-actualization or socialization?

V. Ranking the relative importance of: (10 minutes)
   A. Development of specific values
   B. Development of moral reasoning
   C. Development of consideration for others
   D. Development of skills for acting on one's own values
   E. Clarification of own values

VI. Evaluation of various moral education methodologies (45 minutes)
   A. How would participants teach morals for junior high school students?
   B. Read book on historical figure, write paper on his/her values, receive value feedback summary from teacher (Lincoln, Alger, guy down the street)?
      1. who would be appropriate figures (past? present?)
      2. who would be inappropriate figures (past? present?) negative examples?
   C. Moral discussions – e.g., wife dying from illness, should he steal medicine? (focus discussion on decision-making process)
   D. Role-playing – e.g., take roles of teachers and principal evaluating request for an additional school dance (learn how other side views issue)
   E. Skill Development
      1. select most important value (e.g., friendship)
      2. decide how to put it into action (e.g., make friend by helping new classmate study)
      3. evaluate action (e.g., influence on own values, compromise of other values, effects on others)
   F. Exploring values
      1. complete sentences (e.g., "If I could have three wishes, I'd. . .")
      2. present and discuss (can pass if desired)
   G. Summary – which of these methods best? Why?
   H. Better ways to do it?

VII. Perceived relative importance of moral and ethical education in comparison with other goals of the junior high curriculum (20 minutes)

A. Have participants rank the following educational goals (using large-card sort) and give reasons for ranking:

1. mathematics skills
2. knowledge of the physical world
3. knowledge of the history of society
4. English language skills
5. consumer education
6. health education
7. music and art
8. moral education

B. What percentage of time of an average junior high school day should be devoted to moral education?

VIII. What would people tend to object to in moral education? What should be avoided? (10 minutes)

A. religion?
B. politics?
C. race?
D. self-revelation of values?
E. discussion of home life?
F. sexual values?

IX. If you were on the executive board at RBS, decide if you would invest time and money in developing a moral and ethical education package (10 minutes).

Appendix 2

Summary of Teacher Opinion on Moral/Ethical Education (M/E)

(This table presents trends, not clear majority opinion unless so stated)

	Philadelphia	Memphis	Minneapolis	Los Angeles
Definition of *moral* and *ethical*	• No overall agreement as to distinction between terms • Both terms relate to treatment of others and self • Both terms relate to religious concepts • Distinction between terms of low salience	• *Morals:* are parentally (informally) instilled; pertain to honesty, consideration for others • *Ethics* are taught; pertain to the norm, what is acceptable to the majority	• No overall agreement as to distinction between terms • Some opinion that *morals* are culturally dependent, *ethics* universal	• *Moral* connotes judgments; *ethics* is a more absolute term • *Moral* subtopics: right and wrong, standards
Role of schools in M/E	• Doubt expressed that schools should do this; properly a parental responsibility • However, teachers impart values simply by student exposure to them	• Opinion divided, although most felt school role appropriate • Teachers should assist students in developing their own attitudes; prepare them to live in real world • Problem of feasible approaches to M/E	• Initial opposition to school role (not feasible, too late, danger of imposition of values, confusing to students) • After discussion of possible goals and instructional approaches, consensus that M/E worthy and possibly attainable goal	• Schools must undertake M/E to combat national moral laxity, abdication of parental and institutional responsibility in this area • Problem of identifying societal values in view of currently shifting standards
Role of jr. high schools in M/E	• Jr. high should prepare students for life • Resistance to formal M/E program; favored role models, good interpersonal relationships	• Opinion equally divided as to whether jr. high the ideal time or too late	• M/E appropriate to, but should not be restricted to, jr. high age	• Majority perceived a role • Opinion divided as to whether jr. high too late or prime age

Appendix 2 (continued)

	Philadelphia	Memphis	Minneapolis	Los Angeles
Role of interaction of jr. high school with home and other social institutions	• Jr. high isolated from home and institutions, both of which were seen as abdicating their previous M/E functions	• Jr. high has had to fill the vacuum created by home and institutions abdicating their M/E responsibilities • Busing contributes to diminishing school-community interaction	• Home and institutions are leaving M/E responsibility to the schools	• Home and institutions are defaulting in M/E; therefore schools must carry major burden
M/E in general or special curriculum?	• Regular curriculum • Favored open discussion, with students free to not participate and to select teachers	• Special curriculum • Favored deemphasizing materials; focus on student	• Special curriculum	• General curriculum: M/E should dovetail with existing courses (serve as common thread in, for instance, history, English) • Issue of low salience
Awareness of and attitude toward existing M/E curricula	• *Awareness:* family living, hygiene, ethnic-understanding courses • *Attitude:* generally negative (inadequate guidelines, lack of teacher spontaneity and student-relevance)	• *Awareness:* values section in English literature book; sparse M/E in health classes; one experimental program • *Attitude:* negative (inadequate)	• *Awareness:* virtually none (one respondent only) • *Attitude:* negative (too advanced, imposition of values, inflexible)	• *Awareness:* simulation packages and values-clarification kits • *Attitude:* relatively positive (though materials too limited in scope)
What values (if any) should be learned?	• Understanding, progressively, of self, groups, institutions, society • Tolerance	• Self-worth • Sense of belonging • Respect and consideration for others • Honesty • Compassion	• Consideration for others • Values clarification	• Broad scope favored • Overall goal: consideration for self and others • Problem of demographic variability of student body, leading to differing value priorities

Appendix 2 (continued)

	Philadelphia	Memphis	Minneapolis	Los Angeles
Appropriate source of the values involved in school instruction	• Teachers primary source (as opposed to rigid materials); teachers must be accessible to students • Expose students to majority orientation of middle-class values	• Students proper source of their own values • Deliberate or unconscious transmission of teachers' values • Stories; contemporary notable figures	• Students • Teachers • Materials • Historical/contemporary figures exhibiting specific values	• Not salient: combination of student value clarification and incorporation of new values
Self-actualization vs. socialization as primary goal of M/E	• No strong preference, although some advocacy for self-actualization • M/E perceived as problem-solving, crisis-oriented program	• A balance of both	• A balance of both, since perceived to be inseparable	• Socialization more important, although a combination desirable
Evaluation criteria	• Attitude change, not immediate changes in observable behavior	• Measurable change in observable behavior	• Increased understanding of moral behavior combined with behavioral change	• Opinion equally divided between measurable behavioral change and "intuited" change
Relatedness of content to age-group taught	• Yes, unanimous	• Yes (peer-level role-playing, figures relevant to students' lives), unanimous	• Yes, unanimous	• Yes (appropriate in language, subculture values, current events), unanimous
Self-revealing nature of some M/E-related methodologies	• Negative to forced self-revelation • Voluntary self-revelation desirable	• Desirable but difficult at jr. high age	• Negative to forced self-revelation	• Negative to forced self-revelation

Appendix 2 (continued)

	Philadelphia	Memphis	Minneapolis	Los Angeles
What to avoid in M/E	• Forced self-revelation (though voluntary self-revelation acceptable) • Reading-and-writing exercises	• Imposition of values • Presentation of morality as fixed set of rules (vs. ongoing decision-making process) • Teaching specific values	• Forced self-revelation • Role-playing unless student not required to participate • Inexperienced teacher leading moral discussion • Materials not adapted to variables, e.g., students' achievement level	• No particular proscriptions • Disregard for local-area sensitivities • Role-playing (simulatio preferred)

Appendix 3

Summary of Parent Opinion on Moral/Ethical Education (M/E)

(This table presents trends, not clear majority opinion unless so stated)

	Philadelphia	Memphis	Minneapolis	Los Angeles
Definition of *moral* and *ethical*	• M/E defined as teaching difference between right and wrong; process of values clarification; teaching what society expects; teaching respect for self and others • No distinction drawn between terms	• *Moral* connotes mutual guidance of people • *Moral* values unique to each individual, though age level may affect one's values order • *Ethics* associated with written and unwritten laws	• No agreement as to distinction between terms • Secular and spiritual connotations discussed but unresolved	• Terms seen as inseparable • Both terms imply: consideration of right and wrong conduct, sense of responsibility, relationship to past experience
Role of schools in M/E	• Teachers impart values simply by student exposure to them • Majority favored school role in M/E, partly because of default of home in this respect • Need for teacher training for M/E	• Teachers impart values simply by student exposure to them • Favored M/E in school as both formal program and adjunct to traditional courses • Minority opinion that M/E should be function of the home	• Positive	• Positive • M/E overdue
Role of jr. high schools in M/E	• Opinion divided as to whether jr. high the proper age or too late	• General feeling that jr. high too late, though better than never	• Opinion divided: jr. high too late; jr. high optimum time; jr. high students too immature	• Jr. high too late; M/E should begin in grade school

Appendix 3 (continued)

	Philadelphia	Memphis	Minneapolis	Los Angeles
Role of interaction of jr. high school with home and other social institutions	• M/E should come from both home and school, although home does not always provide it • Some parents could benefit from M/E	• Ideally, M/E should be taught at home • School M/E needs home M/E reinforcement • Home often in default in this area • Influence of peer pressure must be taken into account	• Considerable interaction necessary for successful M/E	• Schools must play major role in M/E due to default of home (although home M/E would be preferable) • Favored involving parents in M/E • Some opinion that schools cannot adequately fill M/E role forfeited by home, church, etc. • Clergy should be more active in schools
M/E in general or special curriculum?	• Special time set aside on a regular basis for M/E, either in extant or new courses • Train entire school staff in M/E (though only some will actively teach it), so all teachers are aware of content and can reinforce it	• Special curriculum (in addition to informal teacher-model role)	• Both special and regular curriculum • Engage entire staff, with extra training for M/E teachers • Some opinion that a year course would be too long; perhaps a semester or trimester preferable	• M/E "camouflaged" in extant courses (English, health, etc.) • Regular basis • M/E should be a 7th-grade requirement
Awareness of and attitude toward existing M/E curricla	• *Awareness:* family-living, health, hygiene courses • *Attitude:* negative (not broad enough in scope) • Need for teacher training	• *Awareness:* health and hygiene courses • *Attitude:* negative (inadquate or nonexistent)	• *Awareness:* sex-education, death-and-dying, racial-equality courses • *Attitude:* negative (inadequate, although minority opposition expressed to sex education at jr. high level)	• *Awareness:* "charm" and leadership courses; minimal awareness • *Attitude:* negative (inadequate)

Appendix 3 (continued)

	Philadelphia	Memphis	Minneapolis	Los Angeles
What values (if any) should be learned?	• Consideration for others (through role-playing), although lasting effects considered doubtful • Self-respect • Common values of world religions	• Honesty • Racial tolerance • Minority opinion for emphasis on commonality, not unique individuality	• Self-respect	• Honesty • Respect for property • Self-pride • Self-awareness
Appropriate source of the values involved in school instruction	• Peers sharing values • Teachers (need for careful teacher selection) • Materials (must be student-relevant)	• Group split on desirability of peers sharing values (self-revelation issue) • Teachers (guiding role, not imposing values) • Materials (must be student-relevant and deal with current issues)	• Teachers • Materials • Parents • Students • Historical figures	• Teachers (since students too young to reason for themselves) • Materials to assist teachers
Self-actualization vs. socialization as primary goal of M/E	• Socialization primary, learn social rules	• Socialization primary, but both important	• Both, with self-actualization chronologically preceding socialization (though opinion divided)	• Both, with self-actualization chronologically preceding socialization
Evaluation criteria	• Behavioral change • Use of values, not simply awareness	• Both behavioral change and increased understanding of moral behavior • Moral reasoning • Improved moral behavior (development of moral reasoning, consideration for others, moral-behavior skills seen as taking years, perhaps generations)	• Both behavioral change and increased understanding of moral behavior	• Both behavioral change and increased understanding of moral behavior, with the latter perceived as the major goal

Appendix 3 (continued)

	Philadelphia	Memphis	Minneapolis	Los Angeles
Relatedness to age-group taught	• Yes, unanimous	• Yes (relate to contemporary figures, ideas), unanimous	• Yes, unanimous	• Yes, unanimous
Self-revealing nature of some M/E-related methodologies	• Acceptable	• Opinion divided, although seen as possible problem	• Negative (although several favored self-revelation methodologies)	• Acceptable, although negative to forced self-revelation
What to avoid in M/E	• Religion • Rigid program • Use of the terms *moral* or *ethical* in program title	• Self-revelation of values (although opinion divided) • Teaching specific topics (e.g., moral reasoning) • Imposition of values	• Religion • Race • Sex • Family-revelation • Self-revelation • Values clarification for immature age groups	• Religion

SELECTED HLP PUBLICATIONS

Boyer, E. G., Simon, A., & Karafin, G. R. *Measures of maturation.* Philadelphia, Pa.: Humanizing Learning Program, Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1973.

Chapman, M., & Hill, R. A. (Eds.) *Achievement motivation: An analysis of the literature.* Philadelphia, Pa.: Humanizing Learning Program, Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1971.

Hill, R. A. *Teaching children to use achievement behaviors and dispositions for setting and achieving personal goals.* Philadelphia, Pa.: Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1975.

Hill, R. A., Chapman, M. L., & Wuertzer, V. J. *Locus of control: A study of the correlates.* Philadelphia, Pa.: Humanizing Learning Program, Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1974.

Hoepfner, R. et al. (Eds.) *CSE/RBS test evaluations: Tests for higher-order cognitive, affective, and interpersonal skills.* Los Angeles, Calif.: Center for the Study of Evaluation, University of California, 1972.

Runner, K. *A theory of persons: Runner studies of attitude patterns.* San Diego, Calif.: Runner Associates, in cooperation with Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1973.

Simon, A. (Ed.) *Classroom Interaction Newsletter.* Philadelphia, Pa.: Humanizing Learning Program, Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1966-1973.

Simon, A., & Agazarian, Y. *Sequential Analysis of Verbal Interaction (SAVI).* Philadelphia, Pa.: Humanizing Learning Program, Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1967.

Simon, A., & Boyer, E. G. *Technical tools for teaching.* Philadelphia, Pa.: Humanizing Learning Program, Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1967.

Thomas, J. W. *Varieties of cognitive skills: Taxonomies and models of the intellect.* Philadelphia, Pa.: Humanizing Learning Program, Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1972.

Thomas, J. W. *The effects of instruction of the critical thinking abilities of middle-school-age children.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D. C., March 1975.

HLP POSITION AND RESEARCH PAPERS ON ETHICAL/MORAL EDUCATION

Hill, R. A. *Ethical/Moral Action Instructional Program: Position Paper No. 1,* 1975.

Klafter, M. (and staff members). *An analysis of the developmental, social learning and values theories of moral education.* (in preparation)

Sanders, N. M., & Klafter, M. *The importance and desired characteristics of moral/ethical education in the public schools: A systematic analysis of recent documents, 1975.*

Sanders, N. M. *Plans for the field test of the Ethical/Moral Action Instructional Program: Position Paper No. 2,* 1975.

Staff. *An annotated bibliography: Research studies reporting experimental effects in the moral/ethical/values domain. (in preparation)*

HLP INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS COMPLETED

Achievement Competence Training: Teaching children skills for setting and achieving their own goals

HLP INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS IN PROGRESS

Skills for Ethical Action: Teaching children skills for ethical/moral action

Language of Personal Experience: Teaching children skills for identifying and dealing constructively with aspects of their intrapersonal experience

Testing Interpersonal Hypotheses: Teaching children skills for interpersonal relationships

Making Judgments: Teaching children skills for critical thinking

Making Changes: Teaching children skills for open-ended creative problem solving, with emphasis on future social issues (futurism)

HUMANIZING LEARNING PROGRAM
RESEARCH FOR BETTER SCHOOLS, INC.
1700 Market Street/Suite 1700
Philadelphia, PA 19103